



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,443	10/11/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010169US1	9168
7590	08/12/2004		EXAMINER	
Marilyn Smith Dawkins International Business Machines Corporation Intellectual Property Law Dept., Internal Zip 4054 11400 Burnet Road, Austin, TX 78758			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/975,443	DUTTA ET AL. <i>SF</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10112001</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because it was not signed by one of the inventors. The declaration identifies two inventors – Rabindranath Dutta and Kamal Chandrakant Patel. The declaration in the record was not signed by Kamal Chandrakant Patel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuppusamy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,769,096.

Claim 1:

Kuppusamy discloses a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (see Figures 1-7; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 16, Line 27; specifically, see Column 1, Lines 14-16 and Column 2, Lines 6-9), comprising:

- retrieving a requested long document from a server communicatively connected over a network to the client (see Figure 2; see Column 10, Lines 9-34 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that it includes HTML documents that are browser-readable; the document in Figure 2 is a “long document”);
- parsing the document for tags identifying headings (see Column 10, Lines 9-19 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that, anytime an HTML document is loaded into a browser, the browser parses every tag in the document; see Column 7, Lines 53-55 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the document is scanned to identify headings);
- displaying a portion of the document in conjunction with a scroll bar (see Figure 2 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that only a portion of the “long document” is visible in the display window, and it implies that the remainder of the document is accessible through a scroll bar);
- in response to receiving a designated user action, displaying list of identified headings from the parsed tags (see Figure 4; see Column 10, Lines 10-59 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that, in response to a user selecting a “TOC in Frameset” option, the TOC document is created); and

- in response to receiving a user selection one the identified headings within list, displaying another portion of document containing the selected identified heading (see Column 4, Lines 38-41 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that, in response to a user clicking on a TOC link, the user-selected portion of the target document is displayed).

Claim 2:

Kuppusamy discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein parsing the document for tags identifying headings further comprises parsing the document for tags identifying hyperlinks (Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that it discloses parsing the document and identifying “headings;” in word processing documents, “headings” include hyperlinks, as demonstrated in Camarda, **Special Edition Using Microsoft Word 2000**, Chapter 19 – **Footnotes, Bookmarks, and Cross-References**, “*Cross-Referencing a Heading or Bookmark*” – this section discloses that cross-references can be either “headings” or “hyperlinks,” which demonstrates that hyperlinks and headings are equivalents); and wherein displaying a list of identified headings further comprises displaying identified hyperlinks in a visual association with the displayed headings (Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the headings and hyperlinks identified are inserted into the TOC document); and further comprising displaying another portion of the document containing a selected identified hyperlink in response to receiving a different user selection of one of the identified hyperlinks (Kuppusamy discloses this

Art Unit: 2179

limitation in that, when the user selects a hyperlink from the TOC document, that corresponding cross-referenced portion of the document is displayed).

Claims 6 and 7:

These claims merely recite a computer system for performing the methods of Claims 1 and 2. Thus, Kuppusamy discloses every limitation of Claims 6 and 7 using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2, respectively.

Claims 8 and 9:

These claims merely recite computer software for performing the methods of Claims 1 and 2. Thus, Kuppusamy discloses every limitation of Claims 8 and 9 using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuppusamy, in view of Amro et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,757,370.

Claim 3:

As indicated in the above discussion, Kuppusamy discloses every limitation of Claim 1. Kuppusamy also discloses that the designated user action is selecting a “TOC in Frameset” option from the menu bar (see Column 6, Lines 56-59).

Kuppusamy fails to expressly disclose:

- a designated user action that is a right mouse click within the scroll bar area.

Amro teaches a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (see Figure 3; see Column 1, Lines 14-16; see Column 1, Lines 44-61 – Amro teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text), comprising:

- a designated user action that is a right mouse click within the scroll bar area (see Column 2, Line 56 through Column 3, Line 27 – Amro teaches this limitation in that, when the user presses and holds the right mouse button within the scroll bar, a portion of the document is displayed),

for the purpose of locating a portion of a multipage document (see Column 1, Lines 44-48).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kuppusamy, to include a designated user action that is a right mouse click within the scroll bar area for the purpose of locating a portion of a multipage document, as taught by Amro.

Claim 5:

Kuppusamy fails to expressly disclose:

- removing the list from being displayed if a subsequent user action outside of the displayed list area is received.

Amro teaches a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (see Figure 3; see Column 1, Lines 14-16; see Column 1, Lines 44-61 – Amro teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text), comprising:

- removing the mini window from being displayed if a subsequent user action outside of the displayed mini window area is received (see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro teaches this limitation in that it expressly recites that, when the user releases the right mouse button, the mini window is removed; this implies that the mini window is removed when the subsequent user action is inside or outside the mini window),

for the purpose of exiting the document display tool.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kuppusamy, to include removing the list from being displayed if a subsequent user action outside of the displayed list area is received for the purpose of exiting the document display tool, as taught by Amro.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuppusamy, in view of Sotomayor, U.S. Patent No. 5,708,825.

Claim 4:

As indicated in the above discussion, Kuppusamy discloses every limitation of Claim 1.

Kuppusamy fails to expressly disclose:

- identified headings that are displayed in an alphabetical order.

Sotomayor teaches a method for displaying portions a long document (see Figure 3; see Column 1, Lines 6-13 – Amro teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text), comprising:

- identified headings that are displayed in an alphabetical order (see Column 13, Lines 47-52; see Column 14, Line 30 through Column 15, Line 3 – Amro teaches this limitation in that it parses the document, identifies concepts and key phrases, and displays those “headings” in an alphabetical order),

for the purpose of facilitating the location of a particular portion of a multipage document.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kuppusamy, to include identified headings that are displayed in an alphabetical order for the purpose of facilitating the location of a particular portion of a multipage document, as taught by Sotomayor.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Borman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,890,172; Lin, U.S. Patent No. 5,978,818; and Bates et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,585,776;.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH
August 6, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**